

ATTORNEY DOCKET
2001P05275US

In the Drawings

Applicants have corrected errors in the drawings and attach a replacement sheet and an annotated sheet showing changes made to Figure 1.

ATTORNEY DOCKET
2001P05275US

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed January 4, 2005. Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 have been amended. Claims 2, 13 and 21 have been canceled and Claims 28-31 have been allowed. Favorable action is requested.

Objections to the Specification, Drawings and Abstract

The Office Action objects to the specification due to the missing serial number of an application in the "Related Application Section," the description of "mobile station 106" with respect to Figure 1, and the inclusion of a title on the abstract page. Applicants have amended the corresponding sections of the specification, drawings and abstract to address these objections. With respect to the drawing amendment, reference numerals "106a and 106b" have been amended to be "106." A proposed drawing correction is attached. Reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

§112 Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended these claims to address the rejection. Reconsideration and favorable action is requested.

§103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-13, 5-16, 18-21, 23-24, 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 2002/0080719 to Stefan Parkvall et al ("Stefan") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6633,635 to Fen-Chung Kung et al. ("Kung"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for reasons stated below.

Claim 12, as amended, recites "logic encoded on the at least one computer processable medium, the logic operable to:

. . . determine that the mobile station fails to acknowledge successful receipt of the mobile-terminated message; and generate, in response to the determination that the mobile station fails to acknowledge successful receipt of the mobile-terminated message, a mobile-

ATTORNEY DOCKET
2001P05275US

**originated message containing at least a portion of the information
for communication to a public network.**

The reference relied on in the Office Action in rejecting Claim 12 fails to disclose this combination of limitations. In particular, neither *Parkvall* nor *Kung* discloses logic operable to generate, in response to a determination that the mobile station fails to acknowledge successful receipt of the mobile-terminated message, a mobile-oriented message . . . for communication to a public network." Rather, *Parkvall* involves scheduling transmission of data over a transmission channel based on signal quality of a receive channel and the repeated transmission in the absence of an acknowledgement message. *Kung* merely discloses that an IP Network can communicate with a public network. But nothing in either of these references discloses logic operable to generate, in response to a determination that the mobile station fails to acknowledge successful receipt of the mobile-terminated message, a mobile-originated message.

In rejected the unamended version of Claim 12, the Office Action concedes that "*Parkvall* fails to explicitly disclose that the base station will be generating a mobile-originated message containing at least a portion of the information for communication to a public network if the mobile station fails to acknowledge successful receipt of the mobile-terminated message, the public network operable to communicate the mobile-originated message to the mobile station," but asserts that "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the base station of *Parkvall* with the capabilities of communicating the mobile station through the PSTN as taught by *Kung* so that mobile-oriented message can originate from the base station to the mobile stations either directly or going through another adjacent network like a public network through the same intended mobile stations."

Regardless of whether the proposed modification would have been obvious, the proposed modification fails to teach the above-described combination of limitations and therefore Claim 12, as amended, is allowable. The capabilities taught by *Kung* referred to in the third paragraph of page 4 of the Office Action do not include a disclosure of logic operable to generate, in response to a determination that the mobile station fails to acknowledge successful receipt of the mobile-terminated message, a mobile-originated message. It is noted that the Office Action concedes *Parkvall* fails to disclose generating a mobile-originated message containing at least a portion of the information for communication to a public network if the mobile station fails to acknowledge successful

**ATTORNEY DOCKET
2001P05275US**

receipt of the mobile-terminated message, and that the Office Action asserts merely that *Kung* discloses traffic compatability between an IP network and a public network, but not that *Kung* discloses generating a mobile-originated message containing at least a portion of the information for communication to a public network if the mobile station fails to acknowledge successful receipt of the mobile-terminated message.

As failing to disclose all limitations of Claim 12, the rejection is improper and claim 12 is allowable, as are the claims depending therefrom. Independent Claims 1 and 20 are allowable for analogous reasons, as are the claims depending therefrom. Reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the statement in the Office Action that Claims 28-31 are allowed.

ATTORNEY DOCKET
2001P05275US

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and for reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stand ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179 of Siemens Information & Communications Products, L.L.C.

Date: April 4, 2005

Respectfully requested,

CUSTOMER NUMBER 28524
SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department
Telephone: (732) 321-3026

By: Thomas George
Thomas George
Registration No. 45,740
Attorney for Applicants
Tel: 650-694-5191
Fax: 650-968-4517

System AND Method for User Notification in a Communication System
 Inventor: Robert L. Monroe, et al
 Attorney's Docket: 2001P05275US
 Sheet: 1 of 5 Filed: March 22, 2004

ANNOTATED SHEET

